UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-NINTH SESSION

Official Records

THIRD COMMITTEE
35th meeting
held on
Thursday, 17 November 1994
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 35th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. CISSÉ (Senegal)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 93: ELIMINATION OF RACISM AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 94: RIGHT OF PEOPLES TO SELF-DETERMINATION (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 95: SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT, INCLUDING QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE WORLD SOCIAL SITUATION AND TO YOUTH, AGEING, DISABLED PERSONS AND THE FAMILY (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 99: REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES, QUESTIONS RELATING TO REFUGEES, RETURNEES AND DISPLACED PERSONS AND HUMANITARIAN QUESTIONS (continued)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of the publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-794, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.3/49/SR.35
2 December 1994

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

94-82383 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 3.40 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 93: ELIMINATION OF RACISM AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued) (A/C.3/49/L.8/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/49/L.8/Rev.1

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.3/49/L.8/Rev.1 entitled "Third Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination".

2. Mr. REZVANI (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that, having further analysed the revised draft resolution, his delegation wished to add an amendment to those it had previously introduced. He accordingly proposed that the words "and the effects of restrictive immigration policies against them", which had originally appeared in paragraph 17 of the draft resolution, should be added after the word "families" in paragraph 6.

3. Mr. MUCH (Germany), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said he was distressed that a delegation should wish to interfere with the consensus on the draft resolution that was certain to be achieved thanks to the commendable efforts of the Group of African States, which had drafted it. He therefore rejected the proposed amendment.

4. Mr. ORDZHONIKIDZE (Russian Federation), supported by Mr. OULD MOHAMED LEMINE (Mauritania), Mr. LAMPTEY (Ghana) and Miss DIOP (Senegal) said that last-minute amendments should not be introduced when lengthy discussions with a view to reaching agreement had already been conducted. As the draft resolution addressed a vital issue, it was important that it should be adopted by consensus, particularly since it contained the Revised Programme of Action for the Third Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (1993-2003). He therefore appealed to the Iranian representative not to insist on his proposed amendment.

5. Mr. REZVANI (Islamic Republic of Iran) confessed surprise at the reaction to his modest amendment, which addressed a relevant concern and contained wording that had appeared in the original draft, and was not intended to disrupt the consensus adoption of that extremely important document. His country, however, had not been party to the relevant consultations, and its views could therefore only be expressed from the floor. Since, however, the draft resolution related to an entire decade, he believed that further work could be carried out the following year and therefore agreed to respond to the appeals made by withdrawing his amendment for the sake of consensus.

6. Draft resolution A/C.3/49/L.8.Rev.1 was adopted.

7. Mr. KUEHL (United States of America) affirmed that his country was pleased to join the consensus on combating racism and racial discrimination and noted with satisfaction that the draft resolution had no budget implications. As in

other United Nations programmes, the United States would seek to achieve savings in the Programme of Action adopted by the draft resolution with a view to enhancing the effectiveness of the United Nations.

AGENDA ITEM 94: RIGHT OF PEOPLES TO SELF-DETERMINATION (continued) (A/C.3/49/L.5/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/49/L.5/Rev.1

8. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.3/49/L.5/Rev.1 entitled "The right of the Palestinian people to self-determination", which was now also sponsored by Bahrain and Kuwait. He also drew attention to the oral amendment introduced at an earlier meeting to paragraph 3 by replacing the words "extend their support to" by the words "continue to support".

9. Mr. ELDEEB (Egypt), whose delegation was the coordinator for the draft resolution, expressed gratitude on behalf of its sponsors to all delegations which had cooperated with a view to producing a consensus draft. He also announced that Guinea and the Lao People's Democratic Republic had joined the sponsors.

10. Mr. YAACOBI (Israel), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that, despite the title of the draft resolution, the issue in question was not self-determination. It was commitment to the agreements signed by the Palestine Liberation organization (PLO) and his country, as well as to one of the principles underlying the peace process: direct negotiation without preconditions. That principle had paved the way for the Declaration of Principles on Interim Self-Government, in which the two parties had agreed to negotiate the issues relating to permanent status at a later stage. Yet the draft resolution prepared by the PLO was intended to predetermine the outcome of those permanent-status talks. His country would therefore vote against it, and it urged all Member States that supported the peace process to do the same.

11. Mr. BIØRN LIAN (Norway) said that his country supported the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination. However, according to the Declaration of Principles signed by the PLO and Israel, the final status of the Palestinian territories was to be decided by negotiations between them, and the General Assembly should be careful not to interfere. His country would therefore abstain in the vote.

12. Mr. KUEHL (United States of America) said that his country would vote against draft resolution A/C.3/49/L.5/Rev.1. The United States was profoundly committed to the achievement of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East and to the current negotiations, which it was sponsoring together with the Russian Federation. The encouraging progress already achieved, including agreements between the PLO and Israel, held the clear promise of continuing, despite unrelenting efforts from the enemies of peace to derail the entire process.

13. Given that the international community should do its utmost to promote and support that historic enterprise, the United Nations should not adopt controversial positions on issues that were supported by only one party to the peace negotiations, the outcome of which draft resolution A/C.3/49/L.5/Rev.1 could undermine. The Committee's efforts should not, therefore, be directed towards resolutions that would have a polarizing and divisive effect.

14. Mr. ORDZHONIKIDZE (Russian Federation) supported the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and that of Israel to peaceful coexistence. As a sponsor of the Middle East peace process, his country based its position on the view that the future of the Palestinians should be decided in the context of the bilateral talks between Israel and Palestine. Believing that attempts to influence the character of those talks would complicate matters, his delegation would abstain in the vote.

15. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Cameroon, Costa Rica, Eritrea, Estonia, Fiji, Georgia, Guatemala, Iceland, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Malawi, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Norway, Panama, Peru, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Rwanda, South Africa, Swaziland, Uruguay, Uzbekistan.

16. Draft resolution was adopted by 124 votes to 2, with 27 abstentions.

17. Mr. HAMIDA (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that he had voted in favour of the draft resolution in view of his country's full and constant support of the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination. That vote, however, did not signal its recognition of the so-called "State of Israel". He wished to place on record his reservation concerning the references to the Middle East peace process; a just and lasting peace in the Middle East would be achieved only with the establishment of a democratic Palestinian State where all races and religions coexisted as they now did in South Africa.

18. Mr. NIETO (Argentina) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote because it had not wanted to participate in taking a decision that might in any way affect the ongoing peace negotiations between the PLO and Israel. That vote should not be interpreted as favouring in any way the rights of one of the parties to the detriment of those of the other.

19. Mr. COLOMA (Chile) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution and hoped that its adoption would not adversely affect the ongoing peace negotiations. Chile would continue to support the peace process in the Middle East.

20. Mr. CRAPATUREANU (Romania) said that his country had consistently supported the peace process in the Middle East and welcomed the positive developments in that regard. In voting in favour of the draft resolution, Romania had taken into consideration two basic elements reflected in the text: the principle of self-determination and the right of all States in the region to live within secure and internationally recognized borders.

21. Ms. BUCK (Canada) said that her country had voted in favour of the draft resolution because of its support for the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination within the framework of the peace negotiations. Although Canada did not specifically advocate the establishment of a sovereign Palestinian State, it would not oppose it, if the peace process led to that result. Care must be taken to avoid prejudicing the outcome of the current peace negotiations.

22. Ms. HERNANDEZ VALVERDE (Costa Rica) said that, although her delegation supported unreservedly the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, it had abstained in the vote because it believed that the adoption of the draft resolution under consideration would impede the ongoing peace process in the Middle East. She hoped that that process would continue and lead to lasting peace for all States in the region.

23. Mr. WENAWESER (Liechtenstein) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution on the understanding that paragraph 2 did not run counter to General Assembly resolutions which provided that forms of political status other than independence might be comprised within the right to self-determination, if the peoples concerned expressed themselves in favour of such other forms.

24. Mr. AL-KIDWA (Observer for Palestine) expressed satisfaction at the adoption of the draft resolution by an absolute majority. The right of all peoples to self-determination was a recognized principle of international law and the Palestinian people had long fought to exercise that right. Genuine support for the peace process meant that the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination must be supported because there would be no just and lasting peace in he Middle East unless the Palestinian people were able to exercise that right fully. Contrary to what some delegations claimed, there was no contradiction in that regard.

25. The votes cast by the United States and Israel had shocked his delegation. Their attitude was reminiscent of the atmosphere that had prevailed before the peace process had begun. He had hoped that the results of the vote would be different because of what had been achieved in the peace process. It was incomprehensible how it was possible to recognize the existence of the Palestinian people, on the one hand, and deny its right to self-determination, on the other. The peace negotiations must be conducted in accordance with international law and the United Nations Charter. The position of the friendly countries that had not voted in favour of the draft resolution was surprising. The results of the vote would be carefully studied by the Palestinian leadership in order to draw the necessary conclusions for the peace process in the region. Lastly, he hoped that the current session of the General Assembly would lead to more positive developments in order to further that process.

26. Mr. MUCH (Germany), speaking on behalf of the European Union and Austria, Finland and Sweden, said that the delegations for which he spoke had voted in favour of the draft resolution. They warmly welcomed the progress already achieved in the Middle East peace process and encouraged the parties to continue to negotiate in a constructive spirit in order to reach agreement on the permanent status of the territories. He hoped that the adoption of the draft resolution would be part of a new approach towards resolutions on the Middle East, and he attached the greatest importance to the declared intention of the main sponsors of the draft resolution that it should not be seen as predetermining the outcome of the negotiations on the permanent status of the territories.

27. The European Union continued to support the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and had long held the position that the exercise of that right was an ongoing process and could be implemented in a variety of ways. He welcomed the fact that the Palestinian people, in exercising its right to self-determination, had chosen the path of negotiation. The European Union would support that process through specific measures in the economic, administrative and electoral fields. Reaffirmation of the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination went hand in hand with reaffirmation of the right of all countries in the region, including Israel, to live in peace within secure and internationally recognized borders. He welcomed the fact that both elements were reflected in the draft resolution.

28. Ms. FERTEKLIGIL (Turkey) said that her country, which had always consistently supported the right of the Palestinian people to self-

determination, had voted in favour of the draft resolution. She stressed that all States in the region, including Israel, had the right to live in peace within secure and internationally recognized borders and said that Turkey would continue to support the efforts to bring about a comprehensive and lasting peace in the region.

29. Mr. REZVANI (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, but had strong reservations about the last preambular paragraph and paragraph 2. He did not believe that the recent agreements would restore the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and therefore wished to dissociate himself from those paragraphs.

30. Mr. USUI (Japan) said that, although his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, it felt that adopting such a resolution, which urged the international community to support only one party in the peace process, was not a useful contribution to that effort. The permanent status of the occupied territories must be determined by the parties themselves through negotiations.

31. Mr. ALI (Iraq) said that his delegation supported all the rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to self-determination by establishing its own State in the occupied territories, with Jerusalem as its capital. Iraq had voted in favour of the draft resolution, but had reservations about the third preambular paragraph and paragraph 2.

32. Mr. DEKANY (Hungary) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution. Paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, however, should not be interpreted as a departure from the current political framework of the peace process. The draft resolution as a whole should be viewed in the context of the right of all States in the region to live in peace within secure and internationally recognized borders, as stated in its third preambular paragraph.

Draft resolution A/C.3/49/L.6*

33. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take up draft resolution A/C.3/49/L.6,* on the use of mercenaries, and said that Algeria, Egypt, Ghana and Malaysia had joined the sponsors.

34. Ms. NEWELL (Secretary of the Committee) said the draft resolution had been revised in several places. In paragraph 3, the phrase "or threaten the territorial integrity of any sovereign State" should be inserted in the penultimate line after the words "any State". In paragraph 6, the phrase "within existing resources, working meetings to analyse and consider" should be inserted after the words "and to consider" in the fourth line. In paragraph 7, the phrase "with specific recommendations" should be inserted after the words "to report" in the first line.

35. Mr. MATESIĆ (Croatia), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that his delegation opposed the use of mercenaries to violate human rights and impede the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination, particularly since his country had been the victim of mercenaries recruited,

financed and trained by Serbia and Montenegro in order to impede the exercise of the right of the citizens of Croatia to self-determination. In that connection, the report of the Special Rapporteur on the use of mercenaries (A/49/362) did not deal with the issue of mercenaries in the region in the proper manner. The report uncritically presented unsubstantiated charges by the Belgrade authorities, which should have been carefully examined before being given a degree of legitimacy by being published in such a report. Independent investigation was the proper way to address such issues.

36. During the barbaric aggression launched by Serbian forces against Croatia, a number of foreign nationals had come as volunteers to assist in the defence of Croatia. Most of those individuals were of Croatian origin and had come to defend the homes where they or their parents had been born and to protect family members from the bloody fate that had been planned for them. Those individuals had come before the establishment of the Croatian Army and were no longer involved in the defence of Croatia. They could in no way be considered mercenaries, since they had come to protect the human rights of Croat citizens, including the most basic human right, the right to life. Accordingly, while supporting the general thrust of draft resolution A/C.3/49/L.6,* Croatia would not be able to vote in favour of that document.

37. Mr. KUEHL (United States of America) said that his delegation would join others in voting against draft resolution A/C.3/49/L.6.* Although his Government remained opposed to the recruitment and use of mercenary forces around the world, that draft resolution was not the way to address the problem. Attempts to connect the question of mercenaries with drug traffickers diluted vitally important anti-narcotics efforts. The time spent on those issues could be better devoted to more pressing human rights problems. Furthermore, the draft resolution stretched the definition of mercenaries far beyond the terms of that set forth in Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Conventions of 1949.

38. The activities of mercenaries, while criminal in many ways, did not fit the definition of human rights violations committed by Governments. In addition, his delegation did not believe that the Special Rapporteur on the use of mercenaries had made a case for continuing the consideration of that question under the rubric of human rights. The Special Rapporteur had exhausted the study of mercenaries and, in the interest of rationalizing the human rights agenda, his mandate should not be extended when it expired. If the Special Rapporteur continued his work, however, he should take into account the definition of mercenaries contained in the Additional Protocol referred to and should employ more stringent standards when reporting accusations and "rumours" of mercenary activities.

39. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa

Rica, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Fiji, Greece, Ireland, Israel, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), New Zealand, Poland, Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Uruguay.

40. Draft resolution A/C.3/49/L.6* was adopted by 101 votes to 19, with 34 abstentions.

41. Mr. MUCH (Germany), speaking in explanation of vote on behalf of the European Union as well as Austria, Finland, Norway and Sweden, said that the European Union condemned unequivocally the recruitment, use or financing of mercenaries and well understood the concerns, particularly of African countries, which had led to the submission of the draft resolution. Nevertheless, it was regrettable that the report of the Special Rapporteur (A/49/362) contained several considerations that were conceptually mistaken or extraneous to his mandate. Furthermore, the European Union could not associate itself with the request in paragraph 6 of the draft resolution that the Centre for Human Rights should devote, as a matter of priority, more effort to the question of mercenary activities, particularly at a time when available resources for more pressing human rights activities were extremely scarce. For those reasons, the European Union had been unable to support draft resolution A/C.3/49/L.6.*

42. Mr. USUI (Japan) said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution. While Japan did not employ mercenaries or send mercenaries to other countries, it had some reservations about taking up the issue in the context of self-determination.

43. Mr. VAUGHN-FENN (United Kingdom) said that his delegation's decision to call a vote on the draft resolution should in no way be taken to mean that his Government underestimated the sponsors' real concern regarding mercenary activities. The United Kingdom shared those concerns, but did not believe that mercenary activities should be combated primarily as a human rights issue. There were human rights aspects to the problem, but not such as to constitute a coherent mandate for a Special Rapporteur. His delegation considered that the report of the Special Rapporteur on the use of mercenaries (A/49/362) amply illustrated that he was proceeding on the basis of a flawed mandate. The report made no practical contribution to addressing the real problems regarding the use of mercenaries. Such problems should instead be addressed by such means as international cooperation against crime, and the resources currently expended on that mandate should be redeployed to the numerous areas of higher priority within the human rights budget.

44. Mrs. PILOTO (Zimbabwe) said that her delegation would have wished to join the sponsors of the draft resolution.

45. Ms. TOMKINSON (Australia) said that her Government firmly opposed the use of mercenaries, which it considered unlawful, and was currently considering ratification of the International Convention against the Recruitment, Use, Financing and Training of Mercenaries. Her delegation had, however, abstained in the vote on the draft resolution, believing that much of the subject-matter addressed by the Special Rapporteur was already appropriately considered elsewhere in the United Nations, and that recent developments in Africa and Central America had reduced the human rights relevance of the problem of mercenaries.

46. Mr. OTUYELU (Nigeria), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, apologized for having omitted to mention before the vote that the Zimbabwean delegation wished to become a sponsor of the draft resolution. He welcomed the recognition by other delegations of the illegality of the use of mercenaries. That illegality had human rights implications, and that in turn was the whole purpose of the draft resolution. The need to optimize the use of resources was well recognized. It was not the intention of the sponsors to waste resources on unnecessary items; their shared concerns regarding mercenary activities should be seen in the proper context. He welcomed the remarks of those who shared those concerns, and suggested that efforts should be made to make the Special Rapporteur's work more effective. It was for the Committee to decide whether his mandate should continue.

47. Mr. VOLSKI (Georgia) said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution. Georgia had a positive attitude to the inalienable right of peoples to self-determination, and was categorically opposed to the use of mercenaries. However, events in his country had shown that people who called themselves fighters for self-determination sometimes used mercenaries who showed examples of unheard-of cruelty; for that reason, the draft resolution was inappropriate.

48. Ms. MURUGESAN (India) said that her delegation, as one of the sponsors of the draft resolution, wished to emphasize that mercenary activity was not confined to Africa and Latin America.

Draft resolution A/C.3/49/L.7/Rev.1

49. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: France, Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, Uruguay, Uzbekistan.

50. Draft resolution A/C.3/49/L.7/Rev.1 was adopted by 101 votes to 4, with 49 abstentions.

AGENDA ITEM 95: SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT, INCLUDING QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE WORLD SOCIAL SITUATION AND TO YOUTH, AGEING, DISABLED PERSONS AND THE FAMILY (continued) (A/C.3/49/L.9/Rev.1, L.10/Rev.1, L.11 and L.12)

Draft resolution A/C.3/49/L.9/Rev.1

51. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take up draft resolutions A/C.3/49/L.9/Rev.1, on International Youth Year; A/C.3/49/L.10/Rev.1, on persons with disabilities; A/C.3/49/L.11, on youth; and A/C.3/49/L.12, on cooperatives.

52. Mr. SUTOYO (Indonesia), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, announced that the Russian Federation had also become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

53. He said that, further to consultations and with a view to reaching consensus on the text, that paragraph 3 of the draft resolution should be revised by replacing the word "four" by "up to four" and by replacing the words "to adopt" by the words "to consider, with a view to adopting,". Consequently, the word "four" in the first line of paragraph 4 should be deleted. On behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, he commended the draft resolution for adoption by consensus.

54. Mr. AQUARONE (Netherlands), Ms. FENG Cui (China), and Mr. MINOVES-TRIQUELL (Andorra) announced that their delegations wished to join the sponsors of the draft resolution.

55. Draft resolution A/C.3/49/L.9/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.

56. Mr. MUCH (Germany), speaking on behalf of the European Union, and supported by Ms. FURUYA (Japan) and Mr. KUEHL (United States of America), said that the delegations concerned had joined the consensus on the draft resolution because they supported the idea of commemorating the tenth anniversary of the International Youth Year, and welcomed the revisions that had been made to the text. However, the draft world programme of action for youth would have to be discussed in the Commission for Social Development and in the Economic and Social Council. It would therefore be premature to urge the Secretary-General to take certain actions regarding the implementation of a programme which had not yet been adopted.

Draft resolution A/C.3/49/L.10/Rev.1

57. Ms. RAMIRO-LOPEZ (Philippines), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, announced that Azerbaijan, Greece and the Russian Federation had also become sponsors of the draft resolution.

58. Mr. MINOVES-TRIQUELL (Andorra), Mrs. LOPES da ROSA (Guinea-Bissau) and Mr. TESSEMA (Ethiopia) announced that their delegations, too, wished to join the sponsors.

59. Draft resolution A/C.3/49/L.10/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.

Draft resolution A/C.3/49/L.11

60. Mr. AQUARONE (Netherlands), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, announced that Andorra, Armenia, Nicaragua, the Philippines, the Russian Federation and Singapore had also become sponsors of the draft resolution.

61. Ms. FERTEKLIGIL (Turkey), Mrs. LOPES da ROSA (Guinea-Bissau), Ms. ENKHTSETSEG (Mongolia), Mr. PACE (Malta), Mr. SUTOYO (Indonesia), Mr. VENTEGODT (Denmark), Mr. OTUYELU (Nigeria), Miss DIOP (Senegal), Mr. PALIHAKKARA (Sri Lanka) and Mrs. AKHAMLICH BENNANI (Morocco) said that they, too, wished to join the sponsors.

62. Draft resolution A/C.3/49/L.11 was adopted.

Draft resolution A/C.3/49/L.12

63. The CHAIRMAN said that Benin, Ecuador, Estonia, Guinea-Bissau, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Kenya, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, the Russian Federation, Senegal and the United Republic of Tanzania had asked to be added to the list of sponsors.

64. Mr. STREJCZEK (Poland), Ms. MURUGESAN (India), Mr. REZVANI (Islamic Republic of Iran), Mr. SIDDIG (Sudan), Mr. ZAQUEU (Mozambique) and Mr. BUBALA (Zambia) said that they also wished to join the sponsors.

65. Ms. ENKHTSETSEG (Mongolia), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said that the Dominican Republic, Rwanda and Turkmenistan also wished to sponsor the draft resolution. She added that the following revisions should be made: in paragraph 2, the word "Decides" should be replaced by the phrase "Invites Governments, relevant international organizations and specialized agencies, national and international cooperative organizations"; and in paragraph 7, the words "to maintain and increase the support provided by the United Nations" should be replaced by "to continue to provide support".

66. Draft resolution A/C.3/49/L.12, as orally revised, was adopted.

67. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should take note of the reports of the Preparatory Committee for the World Summit for Social Development, contained in documents A/49/24 and Add.1.

68. It was so decided.

69. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had thereby concluded its consideration of agenda item 95.

AGENDA ITEM 99: REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES, QUESTIONS RELATING TO REFUGEES, RETURNEES AND DISPLACED PERSONS AND HUMANITARIAN QUESTIONS (continued) (A/C.3/49/L.14)

Draft resolution A/C.3/49/L.14

70. Mr. KASTBERG (Sweden), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said that Andorra, Belgium, Brazil, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Cyprus, Colombia, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, New Zealand, the Niger, the Republic of Moldova and the Russian Federation had asked to be added to the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/49/L.14, entitled "Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees". He thanked all those who had worked with his delegation in preparing the text.

71. Mr. ELDEEB (Egypt), Mr. ADECHI (Benin) and Mr. PACE (Malta) said that they also wished to be added to the list of sponsors.

72. Draft resolution A/C.3/49/L.14 was adopted.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.